



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Catholic, although he is a disciple of Simon the magician, as I have evidently shown in my apology. Who will say that an 'accusator criminal' and a homicide is a true minister of the church?" &c.

Well may Rilliet say, "To treat Calvin thus within the walls of a prison was to be very sure of victory; to rush into a path at the end of which the defeat of his adversary seemed to be almost certain. Circumstances warranted this hope of Servetus, so that in all that followed of his defence he addressed himself directly to Calvin, as if he had no longer any terms to keep with him, and apostrophized him thus from his pride of place. "You do not know what you say. You are a wretch, if you persist in condemning what you do not understand. Did you think to stan the ears of the judges by your barking? You have a confused intellect, so that you cannot understand the truth. Wretch! perverted by Simon Magus, you are ignorant of the first principles of things. You make men only blocks of wood and stone by establishing the slavery of the will." "Moreover," adds Rilliet, "far from equivocating or resorting to subterfuges, as in the oral debate, Servetus expressly grants the opinions that were imputed to him, and his brief and proud replies are altogether in harmony with the state of mind which the rest of his apologetic plea betrays. Already he believed Calvin to be dethroned, and saw himself placed in safety. The opposition of the council in favour of Berthelier had turned the head of Servetus."

On the 20th of October, the answers of the Swiss churches were laid before the council. They were unanimous in their condemnation of the doctrines of Servetus; while the governments of Berne and Zurich advised his punishment. In a letter to Bullinger, Haller states that the magistrates of Berne had seriously exhorted the council of Geneva to remove that scourge, that their own territory might not be infected. "It was, in fact," says Rilliet, "this advice of the Bernese government, more precisely expressed, no doubt, than in their official letter, which Calvin asserts in two places exercised the greatest influence on the judges of Servetus."

The council of Geneva had still too much the habit of yielding to that of Berne to refuse a sentence which they prompted with a view to their government and as a matter of policy."

Calvin appears to have anticipated the effect of these letters on the council, and affirms in the most solemn manner at this stage, that he sought to exert no influence on the minds of his judges to obtain a sentence of death against Servetus. At the meeting of the 26th October, this sentence was adopted after a stormy discussion, Amied Perrin, the president, insisting that he should be declared innocent and discharged as acquitted; four others voted with Perrin. Seven Calvinists were present, and the remaining nine might be termed neutrals, whose vote is thus accounted for by Rilliet: "The unanimity of the Swiss churches in condemning Servetus; his attacks against doctrines till then held sacred in every communion; among others against the Trinity and the baptism of infants; his condemnation at Vienne as an impious blasphemer; the promises of justice given to the magistrates of that city; the exhortations to severity received from those of Zurich and Berne; the troubles which the partisans of novel opinions had already produced in the churches of the reformation: all these contributed to separate the guilt of Servetus from his rivalry with Calvin in the minds of the judges, and to make them forget the theologian, to think only of the criminal." Need further proof be adduced that Calvin was not in this case at once accuser, prosecutor, and judge?

The act itself seems to have excited little attention and less censure at the time. The enemies of Calvin do not appear to have then attacked him as they have since done; even his great slanderer, the man whom he had caused to be banished, Bolsec, declares he felt "no displeasure at the death of so obstinate and monstrous a heretic; for he was utterly vile and unworthy of the society of men," &c. Rilliet regards the tardy scandal this execution has occasioned "as a tribute offered to the spirit of the reformation; for it is, perhaps, less the rigour of the judges than their inconsistency which has given such notoriety to the death of Servetus. Everywhere else but in a reformed city he might have perished without his memory recalling anything but a funeral pile and a victim. At Geneva he could not lose his life without becoming the representative of a cause and the martyr of a principle."

We are far, indeed, from attempting to justify the cruel sentence, a counterpart of the countless sacrifices of that Inquisition, with whose mild and merciful treatment of its illustrious victims we have been invited to contrast it.

We loathe persecution under any circumstances, and will never become its apologists whoever be persecutor. So far as Calvin was really concerned in the sad tragedy of Servetus, we cannot and will not defend him. He was his accuser, and doubtless wished his death. The spirit and mode of thinking of the age in which he lived might, perhaps, supply some extenuation for both the accuser and the judges of Servetus, but we are far from justifying either. That the majority of those judges were not Calvin's friends or under his influence, we have abundantly shown in the foregoing statement; nor can we believe that even had he desired it, Calvin could have

effected a remission or even a mitigation of his sentence. It is but common justice to exculpate Calvin from the charge of being both the prosecutor and the judge of Servetus; but, on the other hand, we unhesitatingly admit that the part he did take in it was inconsistent with the principles of freedom of thought and action, which are, and we trust ever will be, the characteristics of true Protestantism. We might, doubtless, say much to diminish the sympathy excited by Servetus's sufferings by showing that he was not the mere "poor, helpless, learned man" Dr. Sigmond would represent him; but one of those restless, fiery spirits that delight in fomenting strife and courting danger, one of whom Coleridge might say with truth that "if any poor fanatic ever thrust himself into the flames, that man was Servetus."

We cannot condescend, however, to palliate a public crime, by dilating on or aggravating the guilt of the victim. Such would be but one of the devices by which men have too often attempted to conceal from themselves or others their wicked violations of religious liberty.

It might be said, as it has often been said before, that notorious heresy, such as that of Servetus, must be cauterised at any price; as gangrenes must be cut out and cauterised for the good of the body; but the time is gone by when any one can be deluded into the belief that men's bodies should be brought to the stake for the good of their souls, or the holy name of religion perverted into a sanction or cover for human prejudice or passion, and we would as soon attempt to defend the fiendish atrocities of Hindoo or Mahomedan superstition, recently perpetrated at Delhi or Meerut, by representing their European governors as religious proselytizers or political oppressors, as to justify the burning of Servetus because he was either a propagator of heresy or an enemy to the social tranquility of Geneva, even if the character of one of the leaders of the Reformed Church were more deeply implicated in it than we have shown it to be.

EGO ABSOLVO TE—I ABSOLVE THEE.—No. II.

In our last number we gave the forms of absolution used in the Greek Church for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS and more from the time of Christ. We showed that all those forms consisted in praying to God for the pardon of sin, as that which HE ALONE could give.

We now proceed to give the forms of absolution in the Church of Rome for twelve hundred years after Christ.

We call on all Roman Catholics to read and study this; for it concerns the remission of their sins. It concerns them to know whether they trust in a true or a false method for the forgiveness of their sins; and here we give them the testimony of the Church of Rome herself, in her public and authorised forms and ceremonies for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS.

We call on all Roman Catholic bishops and priests in Ireland to read—and to answer this paper, if they can. Our pages, of course, are open to publish their answer.

The oldest existing records of the liturgy and rites of the Church of Rome are contained in what are called the "Sacramentaries" of Pope Leo, Pope Gelasius, and Pope Gregory. Leo succeeded in the year 440; Gelasius in 492; and Gregory in 590.

Whether the sacramentary of Leo be really his, is only matter of conjecture. In all these sacramentaries there are prayers inserted which are of later date than the popes whose names they bear. But it is not necessary to insist on this for our present argument; for the "forms of absolution" in these sacramentaries continued in use in the Church of Rome until the twelfth or thirteenth centuries.

The sacramentary of Pope Leo, which is much less perfect than the others, does not contain, so far as we have been able to find, any "forms of absolution."

The sacramentary of Pope Gelasius gives those forms very fully.

The sacramentary of Pope Gregory gives them in a shorter space, and evidently taken from that of Gelasius.

We take these sacramentaries (as we do in all cases) from the best authority that we can find—viz., the learned work of the Roman Catholic writer Muratori, "Liturgia Romana vetus," &c. Ed. Venet. 1748.

Not finding any "forms of absolution" in the "Sacramentary of Leo," we proceed to that of Pope Gelasius; and there we find (vol. i., p. 504, No. xv.) "ENTREATIES AND PRAYERS OVER PENITENTS:"—

"Hear, O Lord, our prayers, and pardon the sins of those who confess to Thee, that those whose consciences guilt accuses, the compassion of THY indulgence may absolve; through our Lord, &c."

"O Lord, we beseech Thee, let Thy mercy be beforehand with this Thy servant, and let all his sins be blotted out with speedy indulgence; through, &c."

"Be present, O Lord, to our supplications, and let not the compassion of Thy clemency be far from this Thy servant. Heal his wounds and remit his sins, that, being separated from Thee by no iniquities, he may always be able to cleave to Thee, his Lord; through, &c."

"O Lord our God, who art not overcome by our offences, but art appeased by satisfaction, look, we beseech Thee, upon this Thy servant, who confesses that he has grievously sinned against Thee. It belongs to Thee to give the cleansing of crimes, and to grant pardon to those who sin; who hast said that Thou wouldst rather the re-

pentance than the death of sinners. Grant this, therefore, Lord, that both he may celebrate the watches of repentance to Thee; that his acts being corrected, he may be had in estimation to attribute joys to Thee before Thee for ever."

"I pray Thee, O Lord, of the clemency of Thy majesty and name, that Thou wouldst think fit to grant pardon to this Thy servant confessing his sins and misdeeds, and to set him free from his past offences, who broughtest back on Thy shoulders the lost sheep to the folds; who wert appeased at the prayers or confession of the publican; do Thou also, O Lord, be appeased with this Thy servant; do Thou, benign, be present to his prayers, that, continuing in confession with weeping, he may more quickly obtain by entreaty Thy clemency; and being restored to Thy holy and sacred altars, may be reformed again to the hope of eternal and celestial glory; through, &c."

In these prayers the priest does not attempt to say "I absolve thee;" he only prays to God that God Himself will remit the sins of the penitent, as if that were a work which GOD ALONE could do, and which priests could only pray for.

In page 549, the "Sacramentary" of Gelasius gives:

"THE ORDER FOR THOSE DOING PUBLIC PENANCE."

"In which, as before, the priest is directed to say:—
Do Thou heal his wounds; do Thou stretch forth a saving hand to him prostrate. . . . Do Thou spare him, confessing."

Also to the penitent to be reconciled:—

"Almighty, everlasting God, for Thy goodness release his sins to this Thy servant confessing to Thee; that guilt of conscience may not hurt him more to punishment than the indulgence of Thy goodness to pardon."

"Almighty and merciful God, who hast placed indulgence of sins in a speedy confession, succour the fallen; pity those who confess; that those whom the chain of sins binds, the greatness of Thy goodness may absolve."

"O God, who purifiest the hearts of those who confess to Thee, and absolvest from all bond of iniquity those who accuse their own conscience, grant pardon to the guilty, and give medicine to the wounded, that having received remission of all their sins, they may afterwards remain in true devotion."

"Holy Lord, Father omnipotent, eternal Lord, look upon this Thy servant, . . . and grant a remedy to him confessing, salvation to him repenting, and the aid of soundness to him wounded."

But no trace appears in this ORDER of the form, *I absolve thee*.

In page 552, the "Sacramentary" of Gelasius gives:

"THE RECONCILIATION OF A PENITENT AT DEATH."

Here, at least, we should expect that the highest power of the priest in forgiving sins should be exercised. Yet here, as well as everywhere else, the priest's office is executed only in prayer to God, that HE will pardon sin; but without any trace of the words "I absolve thee."

"O merciful God, O clement God, who, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, dost put away the sins of those who repent, and makest void the faults of past crimes by the pardon of remission, look upon this Thy servant, and, being entreated, hear him asking for himself, with whole confession of heart, the remission of all his sins. Renew in him, most loving Father, whatever is corrupted by earthly frailty, or whatever is defiled by the fraud of the devil; restore him to the unity of the

A ORAT ET PRECES SUPER PENITENTES.

Exaudi, Domine, preces nostras; et contentium tibi parce peccatis: ut quos conscientie reatus accusat, indulgentie tue misericordia absolvat. Per.

Præveniat hunc famulum tuum, quæsumus, Domine misericordia tua: et omnes iniquitates ejus celeri indulgentia deleantur. Per Dominum nostrum.

Adesto, Domine, supplicationibus nostris; nec sit ab hoc famulo tuo clementia tua longinqua misericordia. Sana vulnera, ejusque remitte peccata: ut nullis te iniquitatibus separatus, tibi semper Domino valeat adherere. Per. Domine Deus noster, qui offensioe nostra non vincis, sed satisfactione placaris: respice, quæsumus, ad hunc famulum tuum, qui se tibi peccasse graviter confitetur. Tuum est absolutioem criminum dare, et veniam præstare peccantibus: qui dixisti penitentiam te male peccatorum quam mortem. Concede ergo Domine hoc: ut tibi penitentia excubias celebret; ut, correctis actibus suis, conferre tibi ad sempiterni glaudia celebretur. Per.

Precor, Domine, clementiam tue majestatis ac nominis: ut hunc famulo tuo peccata et facinora sua contenti veniam dare, et præteritorum criminum relaxare digneris. Qui humeris tuis ovem perditam reduxisti ad caulas: qui publicani preibus vel confessione placatus es: Tu etiam, Domine, et hunc famulo tuo placare: tu ejus preibus be ignis addeat: ut in confessione devili permanens clementiam tuam celeriter exoret: et sanctis ac sacris altariis restitutus, spei rursus se eruat, et ceteris is gloriæ reformetur. Per.

Muratori, Liturgia Romana, &c. Vol. i. p. 504, 505. Ed. Venet. 1748.

B ORDO AGENTIS PUBLICI AM PENITENTIAM.

Tu ejus medere vulneribus. Tu jacenti manum porriges salutarem. Tu prece contenti

Item ad reconciliandum penitentem.
Omnipotens omnipotens Deus, contenti tibi hunc famulo tuo pro tua pietate peccata relaxa: ut non plus ei noceat conscientia reatus ad penam, quam indulgentia tua pietatis ad veniam. Per. Do.
Omnipotens ac misericors Deus, qui peccatorum indulgentiam in confessione celeri p'sultis; succurre lapsis: miserere confitentibus quos delictorum catena constringit, magnitudo tue pietatis absoluit. Per.

Deus qui contentium tibi corda purificas, et accens nites suas conscientias ab omni vinculo iniquitatis abolvit: da indulgentiam reus; et medicinam tribue vulneratis: ut perceptive remissione omnium peccatorum, sinceræ deinceps devotione permaneat.

Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, respice super hunc famulum tuum et mediam contenti, salutem penitentem, et vulnerato auxilium sanitatis indulgeas.
Muratori, Vol. i. p. 519, &c.

¹ Rilliet, p. 202, Calvin's language is most explicit:—"From the time he was convicted of his heresies, I have made no endeavour to have his punishment made capital, and not merely all honest men will be witnesses of what I say, but I challenge all the malignants to say if it is not so."—Declaration, p. 1318.

body, as a member of Thy Church, by perfect remission; pity his groans, O Lord; pity his tears; and admit to the sacrament* of reconciliation him who has no confidence except in Thy mercy."

The other prayers in this form are all of the same nature as this—all seeking for pardon of sin, as that which can only be given by God Himself, without the priest ever attempting to say to the penitent, "I absolve thee," or any word of that kind.

The "Sacramentary" of Gelasius concludes with a form "for giving penitence."

There is first an address to the congregation, asking them to pray to God for the pardon of the sinner, as follows:—

"Beloved brethren, let us suppliantly pray the almighty and merciful God, who willet not the death of sinners, but that they should be converted and live, that he, propitious, will of His mercy grant pardon to this His servant turned to the right way; and if there are any wounds of all his sins, which he has contracted since the water of holy baptism, his sins may be so cured in this public confession that no signs of their scars may further remain in him."

Then follows the prayer to God for the pardon of sins: "O God, the glory of the just, the mercy of sinners, grant to this Thy servant the full pardon of indulgence; and being fully entreated, grant him a place of repentance, that he who deplores his former sins may not feel future evils, nor commit others to be further mourned. Release to him, O Lord, all his crimes; and being appeased, restore him to the paths of righteousness; that he, secure, may after obtain by his good deeds to walk among Thy people, and to come to the rewards of eternal life."

This form then concludes with a prayer already given: "O Lord God, omnipotent, everlasting, who hast fallen the pardon of sin in speedy confession, help the fallen, pity those who confess; that those whom the chain of sin binds, the compassion of Thy goodness may absolve."

Here, too, pardon of sin is sought from God alone. The priest does not take on himself to forgive sin: the priest is directed to treat that as an office which God alone can execute.

The sacramentary of Pope Gregory contains:—

Prayers for a Penitent.^a

Prayers for Reconciling a Penitent.^b

Reconciliation of a Penitent at Death.^c

All these prayers are taken from the sacramentary of Gelasius, and are so far identical in substance and in words, that it is quite unnecessary to repeat them here. In none of them is there the form "Absolve te;" in none of them does the priest undertake to forgive sins, but only to pray that God will forgive sins Himself.

These are the "forms" which THE CHURCH OF ROME, for twelve hundred years, directed her priests to make use of, in seeking the remission of sin from God. In our last number we gave the confession of the learned Goar, himself a priest of the Church of Rome, that the form "I absolve thee," which the modern priests of Rome profess to have received by unbroken tradition from the time of Christ and His Apostles, is not to be found in any formulary of either the Greek or the Latin Churches before the thirteenth century.

We have now given the forms which they did use.

THESE FORMS PROVE, that by the unanimous consent of the Church of God, FOR TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS remission of sin was considered as a thing which God alone could give—which priests could only pray for.

Those awful words for man to speak in respect of sin AGAINST GOD, "I absolve thee," were never spoken by

man on earth—not by the priests of Rome herself for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS after Christ!

Yet those words are now declared by the Church of Rome to be an essential part of a sacrament instituted by Christ Himself, and continued in the earth from His day to this!

Where was that sacrament for twelve hundred years?

Where is the authority for that sacrament now?

Where is the hope of remission of sins from God for those who are taught to put all their hope in a late invention of men, which the Church of Christ herself had no knowledge of for 1200 years?

Our Roman Catholic readers have a right to know whether that method of remitting sins which alone their Church tells them is effectual was really instituted by Christ; whether it has really come down by tradition from the Apostles.

We therefore DEMAND from all Roman Catholic bishops and priests in England and Ireland an answer to a question which concerns the remission of their sins and ours.

Let them give us one formulary of the Universal Church of Christ for 1200 years; or even one formulary of the Church of Rome herself for 1200 years, in which a priest was taught to say to his fellow mortal, "I absolve thee."

Let them give us this, and our pages shall publish it to the world; and we ourselves will bow our knees before a priest of Rome, and seek the pardon of our sins, and of all that we have written against the power of priests.

But if they cannot—dare not—attempt to do even this much for the essential words of that sacrament which they profess to believe has come down by unbroken tradition from our Lord and His Apostles, THEN let us, and all our readers, seek the pardon of our sins from God alone, "having no confidence but in His mercy."

THE NEW EDITION OF THE DOUAY BIBLE.

WE most heartily congratulate our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen on the new edition of the Douay Bible, just published by Mr. Duffy, with the "Approbation" of almost all the Roman Catholic prelates in Ireland.* We subjoin, for the information and satisfaction of our readers, the

"APPROBATION."

"This New Edition of the English Version of the Bible, printed with our permission by James Duffy, 7, Wellington-quay, Dublin, carefully collated, by our direction, with the Clementine Vulgate; likewise with the Douay Version of the Old Testament of 1609, and with the Rheims Version of the New Testament of 1582, and with other approved English versions, We, by our authority, approve. And we also declare, that the same may be used by the faithful with great spiritual profit, provided it be read with due reverence, and with the proper dispositions."

Given at Dublin, this 4th day of May, 1857.

✠ PAUL CULLEN, Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland, Delegate Apostolic, &c., &c.

✠ Joseph Dixon, Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of all Ireland, &c.

✠ John, Archbishop of Tuam.

✠ Patrick McGettigan, Bishop of Raphoe.

✠ John Ryan, Bishop of Limerick.

✠ James Browne, Bishop of Kilmore.

✠ John Cantwell, Bishop of Meath.

✠ Thomas Feeny, Bishop of Killala.

✠ Charles McNally, Bishop of Clogher.

✠ Edward Walshe, Bishop of Ossory.

✠ William Delaney, Bishop of Cork.

✠ John Derry, Bishop of Clonfert.

✠ Francis Kelly, Coadjutor Bishop of Derry.

✠ Daniel Vaughan, Bishop of Killaloe.

✠ William Keane, Bishop of Cloyne and Ross.

✠ Patrick Durcan, Bishop of Achonry.

✠ Patrick Fallon, Bishop of Kilfenora and Kilmaedagh.

✠ John Kilduff, Bishop of Ardagh.

✠ David Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry.

✠ John P. Leahy, Coadjutor Bishop of Dromore.

✠ D. O'Brien, Bishop of Waterford.

✠ James Walshe, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.

✠ Daniel McGettigan, Coadjutor Bishop of Raphoe.

✠ L. Gillooly, Coadjutor Bishop of Elphin.

✠ James McEvilly, Bishop of Galway.

✠ Thomas Furlong, Bishop of Ferns."

Before proceeding to make a few remarks suggested by the publication of this new edition of the Roman Catholic Bible, we will say one or two words explanatory of some expressions in the "Approbation," for the sake of such of our readers as may not be familiar with the history of the Vulgate, and of the Douay Bible, which was translated from it. We have already discussed these subjects fully in the pages of the LAYMAN, but we shall make no apology for returning to them on the present occasion.

"The Clementine Vulgate," then, is the edition of Jerome's Latin version of the Bible, published by the authority of Pope Clement VIII. in 1592. The Scrip-

tures were originally written, as most of our readers know, in Hebrew and Greek; the Old Testament in Hebrew, the New in Greek. But, as the Christians in the West knew nothing whatever of Hebrew, and were for the most part ignorant of Greek, it became necessary to translate the Scriptures into the language which they were able to read and speak, viz., Latin. Latin was then the vernacular tongue of the principal Churches of the West. Accordingly, a translation of the whole Bible was made into Latin, probably towards the close of the second century of the Christian era. There is reason to believe that this translation was made in Africa, whence it passed over into Italy. However, towards the close of the fourth century this Latin translation had become so corrupt and full of errors, that Pope Damasus requested Jerome, the greatest biblical scholar of the age, to undertake the task of preparing a more correct version. He accordingly made a new translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Latin, and revised and corrected the old Latin version of the New Testament. The result of his labours is what is called the Latin Vulgate, or commonly received edition of the Latin Bible. It did not come into general use at once. On the contrary, it was long regarded with suspicion by most of the Western Christians, who dreaded any innovation on old-established custom. It was not till the early part of the seventh century—200 years after Jerome's death—that his Latin Bible began to come into pretty general use; and this was mainly due to the countenance given to it by Pope Gregory the Great. Spain was the first country in which it was generally adopted. And towards the close of the seventh century it was generally used in all the Churches of Western Christendom.

Passing over the intervening centuries, we resume our notice of the Vulgate at the epoch of the Reformation. The Council of Trent having decreed, in its 4th session (A.D. 1546), the equality of Scripture and tradition, as co-ordinate parts of the rule of faith, then proceeded to consider the important question, What written document should be declared to contain authentic Scripture? This question gave rise to a long and stormy discussion. Pallavicino tells us (vi. 15) that it was at first proposed to prepare a standard edition of both the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, together with a revised edition of the Vulgate, for the sake of those who were not acquainted with the original tongues. This idea was, however, abandoned, and it was decided to declare at once the Vulgate to be authentic. But, as the text of the Vulgate was then notoriously corrupt, and there was no such thing as a *textus receptus*, or generally received edition of it, the Council hit upon the expedient of authenticating, not the existing Vulgate but, a future amended edition of it. The decrees prescribe, "that care be taken that hereafter the Holy Scripture, and especially the ancient Vulgate edition, should be printed as correctly as possible." It was not, however, till forty-four years after this, that an amended edition of the Vulgate, such as the Council contemplated, appeared. In the year 1590, Pope Sixtus V. published his famous edition of the Vulgate. In his Constitution, prefixed to it, he declares that the text of this edition is "true, legitimate, authentic, and indubitable;" that, "without any doubt or controversy, this is the edition which the Council of Trent pronounced to be authentic;" and that "if any one should dare to impugn its authority, he should incur the wrath of Almighty God and His blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." The subsequent history of this Sixtine edition of the Vulgate is one of the most curious and interesting to be found in the whole range of literature, sacred or profane. We have not time or space to notice it at present. And, indeed, we have already said enough on the subject, in our 3rd volume, p. 44. We must content ourselves with stating summarily that, notwithstanding the above lofty encomium and solemn anathema, no sooner had Pope Sixtus died (which he did that same year, 1590) than his edition of the Vulgate was suppressed by the Papal authority itself. Clement VIII. ascended the Papal throne in 1592, and, in the November of that same year, there appeared, under his authority, a new edition of the Vulgate. It professed to be nothing more than a reprint of the Sixtine edition, with the errors of the press corrected; the fact being that the discrepancies between the two editions amount to more than two thousand, a very small proportion of the whole being typographical mistakes. However, the edition of the Latin Bible, thus published in 1592 by the authority of Pope Clement VIII., is the "Clementine Vulgate" of which mention is made in the "Approbation" now before us.

The "Approbation" next mentions "the Douay version of the Old Testament of 1609," and "the Rheims version of the New Testament of 1582." We have already

^a Van Ess, the learned Roman Catholic biblical scholar and editor compares the anticipatory authentication of a book not yet printed to baptizing a child in its mother's womb (which by the canon law is prohibited), or to the judgment which a blind man passes on colours.

^b It was Cardinal Bellarmine who suggested the ingenious device of attributing all the errors in the Sixtine edition to the printer; and, accordingly, in the preface to the Clementine Vulgate, which was written by him, he actually did make this assertion. But, curiously enough, Bellarmine himself furnishes the materials for exposing the pious fraud. In his autobiography he discloses the whole secret history of the transaction. This imprudent revelation cost him the honour of canonization. When, in the middle of last century, it was proposed that he should be canonized, four cardinals objected on the ground of his improper conduct in this matter, and he accordingly lost the honour of sainthood.

* The word "Sacrament" was then used in a general sense, for any sacred thing or office.

^a RECONCILIATIO PENITENTIS AD MORTEM.

Deus misericors, Deus clemens, qui secundum multitudinem miserationum tuarum peccata penitentium deleas, et preteritorum criminum culpas veteris remissionis evacuas; respice super hunc famulum tuum; et remissionem sibi omnium peccatorum tuo cordis confessione postcentem, dispensas exaudi. Renova in eo, piissime Pater, quicquid terrena fragilitate corruptum est, vel quicquid diabolica fraude violatum est; in unitatem corporis ecclesie tuas membrum perfecta remissione restituere; miserere, Domine, gentium; miserere lachrymarum; et non habentem fiduciam, nisi in tua misericordia, ad sacramentum reconciliationis admittit. Per.—Muratori, Vol. 1, p. 552.

* It is clear that the word *Penitentiam* here does not mean what is now intended by the word "penance;" for the form contains no allusion to any penance to be done.

^c INCIPIT AD PENITENTIAM DANDAM.

Dicit psalmum 61 datum: et iterum dicit: Oremus. Et incipiens psalmum 102 usque; Renovabitur sicut aquila juvenit. Dicit deinde psalmum 50; post hoc oratio sequitur.

Deum omnipotentem ac misericordem, qui non vult mortem peccatorum; sed ut convertantur et vivant; fratres carissimos supplices deprecemur; ut converso ad viam rectam famulo tuo illo, misericordiam suam plenam remissionis indulgentiam; et penitentiam locoratorum indulgentiam; ut qui preterita peccata deplorat; futura mala non sentiat; neque jam ulterius lugenda committat. Dimitte ei, Domine, omnia crimina; et in semitis eum iustitiam placatum reinstaura; ut securus meritorum deinceps inter tuos benemeritos currere; et ad pacis eterne pænam pervenire. Per.—

Deus iustorum gloria, misericordis peccatorum, da huic famulo tuo plenam indulgentiam veniam; et penitentiam locoratorum indulgentiam; ut qui preterita peccata deplorat; futura mala non sentiat; neque jam ulterius lugenda committat. Dimitte ei, Domine, omnia crimina; et in semitis eum iustitiam placatum reinstaura; ut securus meritorum deinceps inter tuos benemeritos currere; et ad pacis eterne pænam pervenire. Per.—

Oraciones et preces super penitentem contentum peccata sua more solito.—Muratori, Vol. 2, p. 209.

Oraciones ad reconciliandum penitentem.—Muratori, Vol. 2, p. 210.

Reconciliatio penitentis ad mortem.—Muratori, Vol. 2, p. 218.